

## 25<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Forestry

### **Items not under Written Correspondence Procedure – inputs from Members**

#### Item 5 Forests and Biodiversity

Member Name	Comments
Switzerland (25 September)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note the progress made in the implementation of the FAO Strategy on Mainstreaming Biodiversity across Agricultural Sectors;</li> <li>• Review the draft 2020-23 Action Plan for the Implementation of the FAO Strategy on Mainstreaming Biodiversity across Agricultural Sectors as set out in Appendix I to this document; and</li> <li>• Recommend that its comments and inputs be taken into consideration in the finalization of the Action Plan.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee may wish to invite countries to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen the mainstreaming of biodiversity <b>conservation and sustainable use</b> in the forest sector and collaboration with other relevant sectors in this regard;</li> <li>• Finalize their country reports for the Second Report on the State of the World’s Forest Genetic Resources, and submit them to FAO, as soon as possible.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee may wish to request FAO to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a review of biodiversity mainstreaming in forestry and share good practices of solutions that balance conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity, and report on progress made at the next session;</li> <li>• Strengthen the promotion of sustainable management of wildlife along the wildmeat value chain, including the One Health approach to better prevent zoonotic disease risk;</li> <li>• Contribute to <del>other</del> relevant work on biodiversity by <b>FAO CBD</b> and other organizations <b>and processes</b> to strengthen forestry <b>biodiversity monitoring, reporting, and review</b> <del>considerations</del>, as appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Swiss intervention</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Switzerland agrees with the recommendations proposed in the text. In order to clarify some of the points, we would like to propose the following amendments – we also will provide them in writing:</li> <li>• In the first bullet of invitation to countries, Switzerland requests that the complete terminology used in current discussions under the CBD for mainstreaming be used. After “mainstreaming of biodiversity” add “<b>conservation and sustainable use</b>”. This reflects both the <i>conservation</i> and <i>use</i> of biodiversity that must both be mentioned.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The third and final bullet of the requests to FAO is in our view missing its broader mission. Requesting FAO to contribute to other work on biodiversity of FAO misses the essential contribution FAO is actually making to the CBD in supporting countries and other organizations with biodiversity information. Therefore, we suggest to amend the point as follows:</li> </ul> <p>Contribute to <del>other</del> relevant work on biodiversity by <del>FAO CBD</del> and other organizations and processes to strengthen forest <del>biodiversity monitoring, reporting, and review considerations</del>, as appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We think these changes are important because the post-2020 framework will include a reporting mechanism. Furthermore, it will be important to adapt future global assessment processes such as the global biodiversity outlooks to the new monitoring, reporting and review mechanism.</li> </ul>
Canada (25 September)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Canada notes the progress made in implementation of the FAO Strategy on Mainstreaming Biodiversity across sectors and welcomes further action as set out in the action plan.</li> <li>We are in the process of finalizing our national report on forest genetic resources and will submit as soon as possible.</li> <li>Canada supports the proposal for FAO to conduct a review of biodiversity mainstreaming in forestry and report back at the next COFO session.</li> </ul>
Ukraine (1 October)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ukraine supports FAO's activities on biodiversity and biodiversity mainstreaming in forestry. In the same we have following comments and suggestions on draft Action Plan: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outcome 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is advisable for Core Action Areas "Improve the sharing and uptake of knowledge, technologies and good practices by countries to mainstream biodiversity" to foresee work on not only sharing good practices but analyzing them and proposing some kind of harmonized approaches</li> <li>Key actions for Outcome 1 should be regrouped aiming better reflecting particular Cre Action Area. For example there is "Facilitate policy dialogue" under the Core Action Areas 1 instead of 3 with is called "Facilitate policy dialogue on biodiversity mainstreaming" or several capacity building activities are under Core Action Areas 2 and 5 instead of Core Action Area 4 concerning capacity building etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Outcome 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Core Action Area 2 "Improve the uptake of knowledge, technologies and good practices" it is advisable to foresee particular input of RC and their meetings.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ul>
Japan (2 October)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the conservation of biodiversity, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) has set quantitative targets for the area designated as protected areas, but it is even more critical to ensure that the area to be "effectively"</li> </ul>

	<p>conserved. Therefore, it is necessary to involve local communities in mainstreaming biodiversity, meeting their needs and respecting them as managers of resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of forest conservation in reducing the risk of zoonotic diseases has been reaffirmed in the wake of the new coronavirus. Japan supports the promotion of the conservation of forests and forest ecosystems through the One Health Approach.</li> </ul>
USA (4 October)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The United States takes note of the progress made in implementing the FAO Strategy on Mainstreaming Biodiversity across Agricultural Sectors.</li> <li>• We support efforts to integrate biodiversity considerations into agricultural activities and recognize the importance of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity to preserve critical ecosystem services and improve food security.</li> <li>• We support the recommendations outlined in the paper, with a few modifications and exceptions.</li> <li>• It's important to recognize the link between habitat, wildlife, and health, and we support the recommendation on sustainable management of wildlife including the One Health approach.</li> <li>• The phrase “Along the wildmeat value chain” is not generally used or clear language. Because wild meat has different meanings in different contexts and in order to avoid trying to define the specific focus, considering risks and regulation, we recommend deleting the phrase “along the wildmeat value chain.”]</li> </ul> <p><i>Strengthen the promotion of sustainable management of wildlife <del>along the wildmeat value chain</del>, including the One Health approach to better prevent zoonotic disease risk.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft 2021-2023 action plan presents an ambitious and comprehensive roadmap of work. We have some items to note regarding the action plan:</li> <li>• On the item to support countries in capacity development on data collection to enable the monitoring of SDG indicators, in particular of biodiversity-related SDG indicators, we support FAO capacity building. We also emphasize that reporting remains the prerogative and responsibility of countries. This applies to all other SDG-related items in the action plan as well.</li> <li>• We read with interest about the “Turning the tide on deforestation” and related FAO cross-divisional initiative to address the agricultural drivers of deforestation. We request more information in order to consider how it should be included in the action plan.</li> <li>• Our delegation has serious concerns about the action plan’s references to Geographical Indications (GI).</li> <li>• A GI provides intellectual property protection, but by itself does not confer or imply product grading, healthfulness or sustainability, including biodiversity conservation.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Unless/until there is peer reviewed evidence to support the linkage between GIs and improved biodiversity outcomes, we reject the key action to “Raise awareness on the potential of GIs to preserve biodiversity and contribute to nutrition and healthy diets.”</li></ul>